



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

07/888,857 05/27/92 KWAK

E1M1/1026

ROBERT E. BUSHNELL
LEVY, BUSHNELL, ZITO & GRANDINETTI
1511 K ST., N.W.
STE. 425
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

H P53521

EXAMINER

FRAHM, E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

12

2108

DATE MAILED:

10/26/94

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☒ Responsive to communication filed on 8-16-94 ☒ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), — days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152. |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-38 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.

3. ☒ Claims 23-33 are allowed.

4. ☒ Claims 1-22 and 34-38 are rejected.

5. ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.

6. ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. ☒ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).

10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. ☒ The proposed drawing correction, filed 1-8-93, has been ☒ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).

12. ☒ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☒ been received ☐ not been received ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____

13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit: 2108

1. The drawings are objected to because Figure 3 is not designated by a legend such as "Prior Art". The legend is necessary in order to clarify what applicant's invention is. MPEP § 608.02(g). Correction is required.
2. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.
3. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format of an Abstract of the Disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 250 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 250 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said", should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The recitation of "means" in lines 4 and 6 is improper.

4. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.
5. A substitute specification is required because of the numerous amendments of 1-8-93 which make it difficult to read.

Art Unit: 2108

The substitute specification filed must be accompanied by a statement that it contains no new matter. Such statement must be a verified statement if made by a person not registered to practice before the Office.

6. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The description of figures 1-3 of a conventional color video printer at pages 3-8 of the detailed description of the invention section of the specification should be in the "background of the invention" section. This is due to the fact that figures 1-3 contain prior art, and prior art should be discussed in the background of the invention section of the specification as specified by MPEP 608.01(d). Furthermore, only a detailed description of the invention should be in the detailed description of the invention section; see MPEP 608.101(g).

Appropriate correction is required.

7. Claims 1-16 and 34-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 line 8, "the occurrence" lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 4 line 2, "of" is indefinite.

Claim 9 line 5, the "means for storing...,reading...,accomodating..., applying..., and enabling..." is indefinite because it is not supported by

Art Unit: 2108

recitation in the claim of sufficient structure to accomplish the function;

line 6, "accomodating" is indefinite.

Claim 10 lines 5-6, "said recording address generating means"; and

lines 8-9, "said printing address generating means" lack antecedent basis.

8. The functional recitation in claim 10 that the data conversion means performs two functions, that of "storing" color video data and of "selectively reading" the stored color video data is indefinite because it is not supported by recitation in the claim of sufficient structure to accomplish the function. The recitation of more than one function for the data conversion means makes the structure indefinite since it is not clear what part of the data conversion means is performing each of the 2 different functions.

9. Claims 10-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. MPEP § 706.03(f).

In claim 10 it is not clear where the printing signal is coming from, or what element is doing the printing in response to the printing signal.

Art Unit: 2108

In claim 17 lines 14-15, "a converted chrominance components" and "converted external color signals" are not properly interrelated to the analog-to-digital converting means; also there is no cooperational relationship between the first, second, and third selection signals, the mode signal, and the color video printer.

In claim 18, there is no cooperational relationship between the recording mode, printing mode, and monitoring mode signals, and the color video printer.

It is suggested that the control means of claims 17 and 18 be inserted into the claims to provide an interrelationship of elements.

10. Applicant's arguments filed 8-16-94 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Applicant indicates in the remarks of the 8-16-94 amendment that the abstract and the drawings (figure 3) were corrected. However no such papers were received by the PTO. Appropriate response is requested.

Applicant argue that the interrelationship between the first, second, third selection signals, and mode signals and the color video printer is inherent in claims 17 and 18. The Examiner disagrees and maintains the rejection as given above as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements.

Serial Number: 07/888,857


-6-

Art Unit: 2108


11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See M.P.E.P. § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric Frahm whose telephone number is (703) 308-1317.



EF
October 20, 1994



BENJAMIN R. FULLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 218